APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,891	04/13/2004	Brant L. Candelore	SNY-T5707.02	4007

24337   7590   05/01/2008
MILLER PATENT SERVICES
2500 DOCKERY LANE
RALEIGH, NC 27606

EXAMINER
CASTRO, ALFONSO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4142	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/822,891	CANDELORE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ALFONSO CASTRO	4142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*13 April 2004*</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>*13 April 2004*</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :11/3/04, 3/15/05, 6/2/05, 7/29/05, 10/28/05, 1/27/06, 4/25/06, 7/24/06, 10/30/06, 2/12/07, 3/13/2007, 5/17/07, 06/29/07, 9/10/07, 1/14/08.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in response to application number: 10/822891, filed on

4/13/2004. Claims 1-29 have been examined and are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   Acknowledgement is hereby made of receipt of Information Disclosure
Statement(s) filed by applicant on November 3, 2004, March 15, 2005, June 2, 2005,
July 29, 2005, October 28, 2005, January 27, 2006, October 30, 2006, February 12,
2007, March 13, 2007, June 29, 2007, September 10, 2007 January 14, 2008 and are
considered.   The Information Disclosure Statement filed May 17, 2007 was not
considered.

Due to the excessively lengthy Information Disclosure Statement submitted by
applicant, the examiner has given only a cursory review of the listed references. In
accordance with MPEP 609.04(a), applicant is encouraged to provide a concise
explanation of why the information is being submitted and how it is understood to be
relevant. Concise explanations (especially those which point out the relevant pages and
lines) are helpful to the Office, particularly where documents are lengthy and complex
and applicant is aware of a section that is highly relevant to patentability or where a
large number of documents are submitted and applicant is aware that one or more are
highly relevant to patentability. Applicant is required to comply with this statement for
any non-English language documents. See 37 CFR § 1.56 Duty to Disclose Information
Material to Patentability.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   Claim 26 is rejected under 35 USC §112 sixth paragraph. In claim 26, applicant

appears to be invoking 112 sixth paragraph "means for receiving input data...", "means

for receiving input data...", " means for assembling the private data". No particular

structures are identified in the specification that would perform the function. Claim 26 is

directed to a "content substitution encoder". One of ordinary skill in the art would not be

apprised of what structures are intended to be encompassed by the claim[s]. Nor would it be clear what the structures are intended to accomplish.

In claim 26, it is not clear whether all or part of the claim is functional or non-functional language because claim 26 is specifically directed to "means for receiving input data", "means for assembling the private data", while other limitations are not directed to means plus function language... "packet identifier..." and "private data generator...".

Appropriate correction is required in response to this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-18, 20-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Flickinger et al. PG Pub 2005/0210502 based on provisional 60/229,156

filed on August 31, 2000.

6.   As to Claim 1, Flickinger et al. teaches:

"content substitution" (0041 line 1-22 – invention used to insert ads into television

programming or replace existing data in data streams where [0049] line 1-7 teaches

storing ads are content);

"receiving data representing video content" (0028 lines 1-10; 0030 lines 11-14;

and 0031 lines 1-5; and 0045 – transmitting video content).

"data having at least first and second packet identifiers (PIDs) associated with a

first and a second macroblock of content" ([0077] line 3-13 – a separate PID is created

for each data stream and for each ad program stream. Applicant defines macroblock as

an object formed from a collection of one or more blocks used to produce a video

picture [Page 2, [0021] line 21-27. Flickinger et al. contains an enabled disclosure for

the transmitted data having PID associated with macroblock of content. As shown in the second reference "MPEG-2 Transmission" page 2 discloses MPEG data stream comprising video access units and an access unit will be a complete encoded video frame where access units correspond to more than one macroblock associated with a respective packet identifiers.   This is a multiple reference rejection under MPEP 2131.01).

"initiating processing of content having the first PID" ([0048] line 3-5, ads are transmitted to the STBs for storage until they are played corresponds to processing the first PID)

"determining that a substitution criterion has been met" (as defined in applicant's Page 3, [0027] Col. 1, line 12-18 "substitution criterion" corresponds to Flickinger [0042] line 1-11 replacing existing data if desired into the data stream of designated avails by television service provider).

"substituting the macroblock having the second PID for the macroblock having the first PID" (applicant defines macroblock as an object formed from a collection of one or more blocks used to produce a video picture which corresponds to Flickinger [0041] line 6-15 teaching inserting an ad into a portion of the screen where the screen would have to be broken up into blocks to accomplish insertion).

"processing the substituted content" (0093 line 13-15 -- resulting program stream with the substituted content is sent to the display device).

7.   As to Claim 2, Flickinger et al. teaches "carried out in a decoder forming a part of a television Set-top box" ([0035], line 12-16 -- integrated component of Set-top box decodes and encodes data and also inserts ads into the data stream). Also see Figures 5,6,9 and [0011, 0013, 0077, 0098].

8.   As to Claim 3, Flickinger et al. teaches content substitution "carried out in a hardware state machine" (Page 3, [0034], line 9-16 – finite state machine understood to correspond to a hardware state machine).

9.   As to Claim 4, Flickinger et al. teaches a method of content substitution is "carried out in a programmed processor" ([0034], line 9-16 —teaching integrated components of Set-top box for inserting ads into data stream comprise processors [0034], line 9-16, [0035], line 12-16; [99] Col. 2, line 11-16 specification teaches circuit to be programmed general purpose processors).

10.   As to Claim 6, Flickinger et al. teaches "the substitution criterion is met as a result of an operator input" (0097, lines 1-9 updating or switching among multiple ads is determined by viewer selections).

11.   As to Claim 7, Flickinger et al. teaches "processing comprises playing the content" (0048 lines 3-5 content corresponds to ads are stored until they are played;

0093 line 13-15 – playing the content is part of processing steps where the resulting

program stream with substituted ad is sent to television or other display device).

12.   As to Claim 8, Flickinger et al. teaches "the substituting comprises using private

signaling to select the macroblock of content with the second PID and discarding the

macroblock of content with the first PID (0077 lines 1-12 content having PID; (0093, line

7-13 – the ad to be inserted is queued by a digital que tone transmitted in the MPTS

and used to substitute the original ad). Also see 0074 and 0091 lines 1-7.

13.   As to Claim 9, Flickinger et al. teaches wherein the substituting comprises using

private signaling to select the macroblock of content on the second PID while receiving

the macroblock with the first PID" ([0077] lines 1-12, content having PID; [0045] lines 3-

6 main program being viewed while the designated replacement ads are received).

14.   As to Claim 10, Flickinger et al. teaches "substituting is initiated and terminated

by private signaling forming part of an adaptation layer of packets in a data stream"

([0093] line 1-15 --data stream carries digital cue tone used for identifying where the

substituted ad is to be placed in the data stream corresponds to the private signaling

used to indicate when the substitution is to be initiated and terminated. Flickinger et al.

contains an enabled disclosure for signaling carried as part of the transport stream in an

adaptation layer as shown in [0077] lines 1-18 and [0093] lines 1-16 and can be carried

in an adaptation field in a transport stream packet as shown in "MPEG-2 Transmission"

page 8 and 9 regarding transport packet adaptation layer. Flickinger et al. teaches this limitation for private signaling carried as part of an adaptation layer in a transport stream packet in a data stream. This is a multiple reference rejection under MPEP 2131.01).

15.   As to Claim 11, Flickinger et al. teaches "adaptation layer is in a packet with the second PID" ([0093], line 1-15 – programming stream in form of DVB transport stream or multiple program transport stream and is understood to contain signaling tables and adaptation fields which may be contained in either one of the transport streams of the MPTS).

16.   As to Claim 12, Flickinger et al. teaches "adaptation layer is in a packet with the first PID" ([0093], line 1-15 – programming stream in form of DVB transport stream or multiple program transport stream and is understood to contain signaling tables and adaptation fields which may be contained in either one of the transport streams of the MPTS).

17.   As to Claim 13, Flickinger et al. teaches "adaptation layer is in a packet that is neither the second nor the first PID" ([0093], line 1-15 – multiple program transport stream which may contain multiple PIDs and understood that an adaptation layer may be may be indicated in any of the PIDs where multiple is understood to mean more than two).

18.   As to Claim 14, Flickinger et al. teaches "a computer readable medium storing instructions which, when executed on a programmed processor, carry out the content substitution method according to Claim 1" ([0099], Col. 2, line 4-18, processing steps correspond to software or hardware encompassing processors, computers, CPUs and programmed general purpose processors to include memory).

19.   As to Claim 16, Flickinger et al. teaches a method of content substitution "carried out in a decoder forming part of a television Set-top box" ([0035], line 12-16 -- integrated component of Set-top box decodes and encodes data and also inserts ads into the data stream).

20.   As to Claim 17, Flickinger et al. teaches a method of content substitution comprising the method being "carried out in a hardware state machine" ([0034], line 9-16 -- finite state machine understood to correspond to a hardware state machine).

21.   As to Claim 18, Flickinger et al. teaches a method of content substitution comprising method "carried out in a programmed processor" ([0034], line 9-16 — teaching integrated components of Set-top box for inserting ads into data stream comprise processors [0034], line 9-16, [0035], line 12-16; [99] Col. 2, line 11-16 specification teaches circuit to be programmed general purpose processors).

22.   As to Claim 20, Flickinger et al. teaches "substitution criterion is met as a result

of an operator input" (0097, lines 1-9 updating or switching among multiple ads is

determined by viewer selections).

23.   As to Claim 21, Flickinger et al. teaches "substituting comprises using private

signaling to select the macroblock of content with the secondary PID and discarding the

macroblock of content with the primary PID" (0093, line 7-13 – the ad to be inserted is

queued by a digital que tone and the original ad is substituted).

24.   As to Claim 22, Flickinger et al. teaches "substitution is initiated and terminated

by private signaling forming part of an adaptation layer of packets in a data stream"

([0093] line 1-15 --data stream carries digital cue tone used for identifying where the

substituted ad is to be placed in the data stream).

25.   As to Claim 23, Flickinger et al. teaches "wherein the adaptation layer is in a

packet with the one of the primary PID and the secondary PID" ([0093], line 1-15 –

programming stream in form of DVB transport stream or multiple program transport

stream and is understood to contain adaptation fields which may be contained in either

one of the transport streams of the MPTS.   Flickinger et al. contains an enabled

disclosure for signaling carried as part of the transport stream in an adaptation layer as

shown in [0077] lines 1-18 and [0093] lines 1-16 and can be carried in an adaptation

field in a transport stream packet as shown in "MPEG-2 Transmission" page 8 and 9

regarding transport packet adaptation layer. Flickinger et al. teaches this limitation for

an adaptation layer contained in a transport stream packet in a data stream. This is a

multiple reference rejection under MPEP 2131.01).

26.   As to Claim 24, Flickinger et al. teaches "wherein the adaptation layer is in a

packet that has neither the secondary nor the primary PID" ([0093], line 1-15 – multiple

program transport stream which may contain multiple PIDs and understood that an

adaptation layer may be may be indicated in any of the PIDs where multiple is

understood to mean more than two. Flickinger et al. contains an enabled disclosure for

signaling carried as part of the transport stream in an adaptation layer as shown in

[0077] lines 1-18 and [0093] lines 1-16 and can be carried in an adaptation field in a

transport stream packet as shown in "MPEG-2 Transmission" page 8 and 9 regarding

transport packet adaptation layer. Flickinger et al. teaches this limitation for an

adaptation layer contained in a transport stream packet in a data stream. This is a

multiple reference rejection under MPEP 2131.01).

27.   As to Claim 25, Flickinger et al. teaches "a computer readable medium storing

instructions which, when executed on a programmed processor, carry out the content

substitution method" ([0099], Col. 2, line 4-18, processing steps correspond to software

or hardware encompassing processors, computers, CPUs and programmed general

purpose processors to include memory).

28.   As to claim 26, Flickinger et al. teaches:

"a content substitution encoder" ([0052], line 1-10 – ads, ad metadata, and programming content are encoded);

"means for receiving input data representing at least one macroblock of main content" (([0052], line 1-10; Figure 9, 901 identifies MPTS transport stream with programming);

"means for receiving input data representing at least one macroblock of substitution content" ([0052], line 1-10; Figure 9, 901 identifies MPTS transport stream with ads and ads metadata);

"a packet identifier (PID) mapper that assigns a primary PID to the main content and assigns a secondary PID to the substitution content" ([0093], line 1-15 – DVB transport stream i.e. MPTS understood to identify packets with PIDs when transported)

"a private data generator that generates user private data that identifies the main content by the primary PID and substitution content by the secondary PID" ([0095], line 1-5 – the ad insertion module (904) requests the appropriate ad and then inserts the ad with the proper timing);

"means for assembling the private data, the main content mapped to the primary PID and the substitution content mapped to the secondary PID into a data stream" ([0093], lines 11-15 –An ad insertion module inserts or splices the queued ad according to the cue tone timing and a resulting program stream with the substituted ad is decoded by decoder module and sent to a television or other display device);

29.   As to Claim 27, Flickinger et al. teaches the content substitution encoder

"implemented using a programmed computer" ([0099], Col. 2, line 11-16 -- encoder

corresponds to software, hardware, or circuit which encompasses computers or

programmed general purpose processors).

30.   As to Claim 28, Flickinger et al. teaches:

        "a decoder" (Page 9, Col. 2 -- claim 22 processor configured to decode)

        "a receiver receiving data that represents content" ([0052], line 1-10; Figure 9,

901 shows MPTS transport stream received with ads and ads metadata) "the data

having at least first and second packet identifiers (PIDs) associated with a first and

second macroblock of content" ([0093], line 1-15 – DVB transport stream i.e. MPTS

understood to identify packets with PIDs when transported);

        "a content decoder configured to play content having the first PID" (Page 9, Col.

2 -- claim 22 set-top processor configured to transmit signals to a television);

        "a controller that determines that a substitution criterion has been met" ([0095],

line 1-5, detection module 910 detects the cue tone to indicate an insertion of an ad is to

take place);

        "a PID mapper that maps content having the second PID to the first PID so that

the content originally having the second PID is played" ([0093], lines 11-15 – an ad

insertion module inserts or splices the queued ad according to the cue tone timing and a

resulting program stream with the substituted ad is decoded by decoder module and

sent to a television or other display device).

31.   As to Claim 29, Flickinger et al. teaches "decoder resides in a television Set-top

box" (Page 9, Col. 2 -- claim 22 set-top processor configured to decode).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

32.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

33.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

34.   Claims 5, 15,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Flickinger et al. PG Pub 2005/0210502 based on provisional 60/229,156 filed on August

31, 2000.

35.   As to Claim 5 and 19, Flickinger et al. does not specifically teach a method of content substitution wherein "the substitution criterion is met as a result of receipt of a flag".

On the other hand, Flickinger et al. does teach placement of an indicator for a location where a substitution of content is to start and end taught by Flickinger as avails (0041, line 17-19). The substitution criterion is met as a result of a flag as claimed by applicant corresponds to designating an indicator for the location of where a substitution of content is to start and end taught by Flickinger in avails.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Flickinger et al. to designate a "flag" for an indicator for the beginning and end of an "avail". The "avails" as taught by Flickinger et al. include open ad breaks designated specifically for the insertion of ads by the television service provider (page 3, 0042, lines 1-4).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Flickinger et al. for inserting targeted ads into television programming, or for inserting any particular data into any particular stream, or in an overlay/insertion system transmitted via a communications system (page 1, Col. 13, lines 1-6). The teachings of Flickinger et al. would have allowed the method of applicant to know where the television service provider is to insert or substitute ads in the programming (page 3, 0042, lines 1-4) where substitution criterion corresponds to targeting criteria (0045 and 0046).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art to use a

method of indicating when and where an ad is to be inserted or replaced as taught by

Flickinger et al. (page 1, Col. 13, lines 1-6). Using an indicator for identifying the

location of where ads or data is to be inserted/overlayed in the programming or original

data stream would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As to Claim 19, Flickinger et al. teaches "substitution criterion is met as a result

of receipt of a flag" (0041, line 17-19 – flag corresponds to the indicator of a location

where a substitution of content is to start and end as taught by Flickinger as avails).

36.   As to Claim 15, Flickinger et al. teaches:

"receiving data representing content" ([0049], line 7-10 – content corresponds to

ads and metadata about the ads are delivered in programming stream where [0049] line

1-7 teaches storing ads are content);

"the data having at least primary and secondary packet identifiers (PIDs)

associated with a first and second macroblock of content" [0077] line 3-4 – a separate

PID could be created for each data stream and for each ad program stream).

"placing content having the primary PID into a data stream" ([0042], line 1-11,

main programming is part of normal stream of information);

Flickinger et al. does not specifically teach "receiving an initiation flag indicating

initiation of a PID mapping operation" where "mapping" is understood to mean indicating

the main content from substitutable content as described by applicant in [0031], line 13-17).

However, Flickinger et al. teaches scheduler 912 receives instructions on when ad should be played or substituted ([0094], line 1-10). Flickinger et al. also teaches placement of an indicator for a location where a substitution of content is to start and end taught as avails (0041, line 17-19). The substitution criterion is met as a result of a flag as claimed by applicant corresponds to designating an indicator for the location of where a substitution of content is to start and end as taught by Flickinger.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Flickinger et al. to designate a "flag" for an indicator for the beginning and end of an "avail" and comprising a "scheduler". The "avails" as taught by Flickinger et al. include open ad breaks designated specifically for the insertion of ads by the television service provider (page 3, 0042, lines 1-4).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Flickinger et al. for inserting targeted ads into television programming, or inserting any particular data into any particular stream, or in an overlay/insertion system transmitted via a communications system (page 1, Col. 13, lines 1-6). The teachings of Flickinger et al. would have allowed the method of applicant to identify where the television service provider is to insert or substitute ads in the programming (page 3, 0042, lines 1-4) where substitution criterion corresponds to targeting criteria (0045 and 0046).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art to use a method of indicating when and where an ad is to be inserted or replaced as taught by Flickinger et al. (page 1, Col. 13, lines 1-6). Using an indicator or "flag" for identifying the location of where ads or data is to be inserted/overlayed in the programming or original data stream would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

"mapping content having the secondary PID to the primary PID and placing the mapped content into the data stream" ([0041] line 1-6, ads inserted into programming or inserting any data into any other data stream)

Conclusion

37.   The prior art made of record and relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

      2005/0210502

38.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

      US 6698020

      US 2002/0044558

      US 2002/0100054

      US 2005/0283797

      US 7055166.

      Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to ALFONSO CASTRO whose telephone number is

(571)270-3950. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday (8am to

5pm EST).

      If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Srirama Channavajjala can be reached on 571-272-4108. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

04/23/2008
ac

/Srirama Channavajjala/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4142